

REMARKS

The Final Office Action, mailed July 24, 2008, considered claims 1-28. Claims 1, 3-11, 14, 19, 21-23, and 25-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Aronson. Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aronson in view of Koponen.

By this response, claims 1, 5, 7-9, 11, 21, 23, 25, and 26 are amended. Claims 1-11, 14, 19, 21-23, and 25-29 remain pending of which claims 1, 14, and 23 are independent.

The present invention is generally directed towards embodiments for filtering messages received by an inbox program by leveraging the existing message-handling architecture of a computer device, thus allowing messages to be sent to applications *other than the inbox program*. A rule client registers to receive messages by registering a DLL in the system registry as a COM object. In this way, the rule client is loaded in the inbox program's process space when a message is received, thus eliminating the need for special logic to determine what application is loading the rule client. *See* Spec. pgs. 11-12.

When the inbox program receives a message, it may flag the message. The inbox program calls a create message function which passes the message with the flag to the message storing component. This flag indicates to the message storing component that it should pass the message to the rule clients rather than storing the message directly in the message inbox (where it would be seen by the user). By doing this, messages that are intended for applications rather than a user may be filtered out. The rule clients may extract information from the message and provide the information to an application program that is distinct from the inbox program (such as a chess program, *see* Spec. pg. 17). The rule client may then indicate whether the inbox program should discard the message (so that no other rule client may handle it, and so that the user never sees it), or allow the message to pass to subsequent rule clients. Each of the independent claims contains limitations as just described with claim 1 being drawn to a method, claim 14 to a computer-readable storage medium, and claim 23 to a system.

Section 101 and 112 Rejections

Claim 23 was rejected under both sections 101 and 112 because it recites software components exclusively. This claim has been amended to recite a processor and memory which store instructions

for performing the same method as claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits that these rejections are now moot.

Prior Art Rejections

Aronson discloses embodiments for filtering spam. To do so, all incoming messages are passed through a filter. If a message is determined to be spam, it is placed in a separate spam storage area of the inbox. *See* Col. 4, lines 35-44. However, Aronson does not disclose that messages may be passed to rule clients which extract information that is then passed to application programs that are *separate from the inbox program*. Additionally, the filter in Aronson does not indicate whether another rule client may process the message. Therefore, Aronson fails to teach or suggest "the first rule client processing the message such that the first rule client extracts information from the message and passes the information to an application program that is distinct from the inbox program;" and "receiving data from the first rule client, the data indicating whether the inbox program may provide the message to the next rule client in the set of at least one rule client or discard the message," as claimed in combination with the remaining limitations.

Aronson likewise fails to teach or suggest that the "rule client registers by registering a dynamic-link library in a system registry as a component object model object such that the rule client is loaded when the inbox program receives the message, the rule client being loaded in the inbox program's process space." To the contrary, in Aronson, the filtering is provided through API calls. *See* col. 5, lines 22-49.

Like Aronson, Koponen fails to teach or suggest the limitations of the independent claims. Koponen discloses embodiments for classifying messages which essentially works to filter messages similar to Aronson, but does not disclose that messages may be passed to rule clients which extract information that is then passed to application programs that are separate from the inbox program.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all the rejections to the independent claims are now moot and that the independent claims are now allowable over the cited art, such that any of the remaining rejections and assertions made, particularly with respect to all of the dependent claims, do not need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings

or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice, and particularly with regard to the dependent claims.^[1]

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at 801-533-9800.

Dated this 29 day of August, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973

JCJ:jml
2062027_1

^[1] Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting any official notice taken. Furthermore, although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.